

Appl. No. 10/523,463
Amdt. dated July 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 05 2006

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 5, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. Claim 15 has been objected to, and claims 1-17 have been rejected. Claims 1, 5, 15 and 17 have been amended, leaving claims 1-17 for further consideration upon the entry of the amendment. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

Claim Objection

Claim 15 stands objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. As amended, claim 15 is in proper dependent form as depending on claim 5.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Praisewater (U.S. Patent No. 5,939,830) stating that Praisewater discloses all elements of the abovementioned claims primarily in Column 7, Lines 36-39; Column 4, Lines 5-9; Column 7, Lines 25-36; Column 5, Lines 1-4; Column 4, Lines 1-2; Column 4, Lines 5-9; Column 4, Lines 9-16; and Column 7, Lines 36-39. Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102(b) rejections for the reasons stated below.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements "arranged as in the claim." *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1271 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Missing elements may not be supplied by the knowledge of one skilled in the art or the disclosure of another reference. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 780, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Appl. No. 10/525,463
Amdt. dated July 5, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2006

It is respectfully submitted that the invention of the present application with respect to amended independent claims 1, 5 and 17 recite that the sensing section is wirelessly connected to the power transforming/outputting section. In contrast, Column 7, Lines 36-39, of the Praisewater reference discloses "analog comparator circuits can be used to detect resonance frequency of the circuit by monitoring the voltage at a particular node such as the transformer centertap". Thus, Praisewater discloses monitoring the voltage at a particular node such as at the centertap of the transformer which corresponds to the primary winding and not the secondary winding of the output transformer.

Praisewater does not teach or suggest, the sensing section wirelessly connected to the power transforming section, as in amended independent claims 1, 5 and 17. Thus, claims 1, 5 and 17, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-4 and 6-16, define over Praisewater.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the § 102(b) rejections to claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 13-17 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hsu (U.S. Patent No. 6,693,396), stating that Hsu discloses all elements of the abovementioned claims primarily in Fig. 1 and col. 1, lines 44-65. Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102(e) rejections for the reasons stated below.

It is respectfully submitted that the invention of the present application with respect to amended independent claims 1, 5 and 17 recite that the sensing section is wirelessly connected to the power transforming section. In contrast, Column 1, Lines 44-65 of the Hsu reference discloses "the lamp current is sensed with a resistor R1 in series with one lead of the lamp", as also shown in Figure 1 of the Hsu reference. Therefore the sensing section of Hsu is connected by wire to the lamp which is different than "wirelessly connected to the power transforming section", as in the amended claims 1, 5 and 17.

Hsu does not teach or suggest, the sensing section wirelessly connected to the power transforming section, as in amended independent claims 1, 5 and 17. Thus, claims 1, 5 and 17, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-4 and 6-16, define over Hsu.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the § 102(e) rejections to claims 1-17 be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/525,463
Amdt. dated July 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2006

Also, claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hwang (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0003525), the Examiner stating that Hwang discloses all elements of the abovementioned claim primarily in Fig. 4. Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102(b) rejection for the reasons stated below.

It is respectfully submitted that the invention of the present application with respect to amended independent claim 5 recites that the sensing section is wirelessly connected to the power outputting section. In contrast, Figure 4 of the Hwang reference discloses a sensing section including a secondary power transformer T2 having a primary connected by wire to the lamp 350 and the secondary of transformer T1. Therefore the sensing section of Hwang connected by wire to the lamp which is different than "wirelessly connected to the power transforming section", as in the amended claim 5.

Hwang does not teach or suggest, the sensing section wirelessly connected to the power transforming section, as in amended independent claim 5. Thus, claim 5 defines over Hwang.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the § 102(b) rejection to claim 5 be withdrawn.

21C-0187 / LW8048PC/US

Page 9 of 10

Date: July 5, 2006